DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 314 CG 030 431

AUTHOR	Gottfredson, Gary D.
TITLE	Environmental Focus in a Large National Sample of Schools.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Justice, Washington, DC. National Inst. of Justice.; Department of Justice, Washington, DC. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
PUB DATE	2000-08-07
NOTE	16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (Washington, DC, August 4-8, 2000).
CONTRACT	96-MU-MU-0008; 98-JN-FX-0004
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Attitude Measures; *Behavior Rating Scales; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Environmental Research; Morale; *Personality Theories; School Surveys; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	Holland (John L)

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews research stimulated by Holland's (1997) theory of vocational personalities and work environments. It describes new research extending an examination of one part of the theory, environmental identity, to a large sample of school environments. The Organizational Focus Scale (G.D. Gottfredson and Holland, 1996b) was administrated to teachers in a large sample of schools. Intraclass correlations were examined resulting in a 16-item scale. Other school characteristics were measured including: measures of classroom orderliness; measures of school safety; and reports of principals about rates of crime reported to police. The scale was found to have remarkably high correlations with school morale and quality of administrator leadership. Despite limitations, this first study reporting on the application of the Organizational Focus Scale to implement the environmental identity construct produced promising results. Organizational focus was significantly and substantially correlated with a range of salutary organizational outcomes based on the reports of both students and teachers. The correlations with the Morale Scale can be taken as a general measure of organizational health. Appendix A is "Organizational Focus Questionnaire." (Contains 3 tables and 21 references.) (Author/JDM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 446 314

Environmental Focus in a Large National Sample of Schools

Gary D. Gottfredson [1]

The research I will describe today was stimulated by Holland's (1997) theory of vocational personalities and work environments. That theory has generated practical applications and extensive research on vocational personalities or interests, but the amount of research scrutiny and development of practical applications for the environmental portions of the theory has been more limited (L. S. Gottfredson & Richards, 1999). I will describe new research extending an examination of one part of the theory – environmental identity – to a large sample of school environments. First, I'll briefly review the theory.

Main Ideas

The theory assumes it is useful to describe individuals in terms of their degrees of resemblance to six ideal personality types named Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional. Each type is characterized by a distinctive pattern of preferences and dislikes, values, developed competencies, and self-efficacy beliefs – in short, traits. For example, a person who resembles the Investigative type prefers Investigative occupations (such as scientist) that reward inquiry and skepticism, and the person avoids Enterprising occupations (such as used-car salesperson) that call for interpersonal influence. A person who resembles the Investigative type may be described as analytical, critical, intellectual, rational, and reserved. In contrast, a person who resembles the Enterprising type is more likely to be described as acquisitive, adventurous, domineering, enthusiastic, and forceful. Real people don't resemble one type and no other, so it is useful to describe an individual's vocational personality as a pattern of resemblance to the six types. I most resemble the Investigative type, next the Artistic type, and so on.

The theory also assumes it is useful to describe work or other environments in terms of their degrees of resemblance to six ideal environmental models also named Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional. Each environmental model is characterized by a distinctive pattern of competency requirements, demands on inhabitants, rewarded behavior, and rewarded personal styles. For example, an environment that most resembles the Investigative model encourages and rewards people for displaying scholarly, mathematical, or scientific

---

[1]Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 7 August 2000. This research was supported by grant no. 96-MU-MU-0008 from the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice. Additional support was provided by grant no. 98-JN-FX-0004 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions expressed are the author's and do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of any sponsor. Address correspondence to Gary D. Gottfredson, Gottfredson Associates, Inc., 3239 B Corporate Court, Ellicott City, Maryland 21042; ggottfredson@gottfredson.com.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. GOTTFREDSON
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CG030431

efforts. It fosters the development of analytic competencies and investigative achievements. In contrast an environment that most resembles the Enterprising model encourages and rewards people who sell things or services or lead others. It fosters the development of aggressive and self-confident interpersonal styles and an acquisitive power-oriented outlook. Real occupational or other environments don't resemble a single ideal model and no other. The occupation social psychologist usually most resembles the Investigative model, next the Artistic model, and so on (G. D. Gottfredson & Holland, 1991). For a fuller discussion of environmental models see G. D. Gottfredson & Holland (1996a).

The parallel personality and environmental classification allow us to communicate a great deal of descriptive information about a person or an environment in an economical way. Saying that a person looks like an Investigative type provides a lot of information. If we were to add that this individual is employed in an Enterprising job we have more information. We expect the individual to display Investigative competencies, preferences, and aversions. We expect the environment to demand the display of Enterprising competencies and preferences. We expect the person to find the environment unrewarding and to leave it. We expect the environment to withhold rewards and to reject the person. This last pair of expectations is a way of expressing the congruence assumption in the theory. Persons are attracted to, persist in, and are rewarded in congruent environments, and they avoid incongruent environments.

These main ideas are supplemented by other concepts. For example, people and environments differ not only by type but also by level. Level is of obvious importance. And, the resemblance of some people or some environments to the theoretical types is univocal or differentiated. Others have a more diffuse or undifferentiated pattern of resemblances to the types. One secondary idea that has proven to have valuable applications is the concept of vocational identity, to which I now turn.

Identity

"Personal identity is defined as the possession of a clear and stable picture of one's goals, interests, and talents. Environmental identity is present when an environment or an organization has clear and integrated goals, tasks, and rewards that are stable over long time intervals" (Holland, 1997, p. 5).

Initially, individuals' vocational identity was used as a criterion in research testing the validity of diagnostic signs of vocational decision-making ability derived from Holland's theory and the related Self-Directed Search assessment (Holland, Gottfredson & Nafziger, 1973, 1975). An Identity scale was developed to test the idea that individuals with confusing self-information – i.e., who lacked clear knowledge of their own competencies, preferred activities, interests, and vocational goals – could be identified by flat or undifferentiated patterns of resemblance to the six personality types. The hypothesis received only lukewarm support in that initial study, but the Identity scale was correlated with satisfaction with vocational choice and decidedness for both men and women and for persons who most resemble each personality type. Vocational

identity was also correlated with Holland and Bairds (1968) Interpersonal Competency scale and negatively correlated with McClosky & Schaar's (1965) Anomy scale for some samples, and it was correlated with a number of specific complaints of indecision or dissatisfaction. Subsequent research led to the publication of the Vocational Identity scale (Holland, Daiger & Power, 1980; Holland, Gottfredson, & Power, 1980). Holland, Johnston, & Asama (1993) reviewed evidence from many studies showing that identity is related to vocational maturity, interpersonal competence, and little dysfunctional career thinking or anxiety; it is negatively correlated with the NEO Neuroticism scale and positively correlated with the both subscales of the Snyder et al. (1991) Hope scale. The Identity scale has proven useful as a criterion measure in the evaluation of vocational interventions. In the 1985 revision of his theory, Holland incorporated identity as a secondary concept.

Environmental Identity or Environmental Focus

One of the virtues of Holland's theory is its parallel nature – with concepts applying to persons having a reflection in parallel concepts about environments. Accordingly, although Holland (1985) had the benefit of research on individual vocational identity when he incorporated the identity construct in his theory, there was no research basis for the incorporation of environmental identity. Nevertheless, the clarity, integration, and stability of an organization's goals, tasks, and rewards strikes one as a construct plausibly related to desirable outcomes for the organization and its inhabitants.

Holland (1997) wrote that "an environment with a high (clear) identity would have a focused set of consistent and explicit goals; and an environment with a low (diffuse) identity would have a large set of conflicting and poorly defined goals" (p. 50). He repeated his earlier (1985) suggestion that an indirect measure of an environment's identity is "the inverse of the number of its behavior settings" (emphasis omitted, p. 50). This indirect and awkward idea about operationalizing environmental identity has, to the best of my knowledge, never been tried by anyone.

G. Gottfredson and Holland (1996b) devised a brief Organizational Focus Questionnaire to measure this environmental construct. The Organizational Focus scale contains items about how clearly the environment signals what is expected of inhabitants, whether the organization has a clear focus, and whether the goals are clear. Unfortunately, no one tried this scale in empirical research. Until now.

Hypotheses

By analogy with individual vocational identity – which is associated with a variety of healthy individual outcomes – environmental identity or what I prefer to call organizational focus is expected to be associated with salutary organizational outcomes. Just as a person who has a clear sense of his or her own goals, strengths, and weaknesses is expected to be more predictable in choices and have a more dependable repertoire for coping with environmental challenges, so is

an environment with clear focus expected to be more predictable in expectations for behavior and in the rewards and punishments it dispenses. Furthermore, whatever environmental model an organization (family, workplace, etc.) most resembles, the expression of that resemblance should be clearest for organizations high in organizational focus.

In the study on which I will report, the organizations are secondary schools. Schools are predominantly social environments engaged in the delivery of instruction. Theoretically, therefore, high organizational focus (high identity) schools should produce more orderly classrooms with fewer distractions from instruction. And because a high degree of organizational focus should lead to beneficial outcomes in general, high focus schools should be found to have other desirable characteristics as learning institutions.

Method

Measures

The Organizational Focus scale proposed earlier (G. D. Gottfredson & Holland, 1996b, reproduced in Holland, 1997) was adapted by making the wording of items more school-specific. That is, items were re-written to replace terms such as "this organization" with "this school" and four items were dropped because they seemed awkward, or to meet the space limitations of the questionnaire in which the scale was embedded. After administration to teachers in a large sample of schools (described below), intraclass correlations were examined and two items with low between school variance were deleted. This resulted in the 16-item scale reproduced in Appendix A, which also contains a corresponding generic scale.

Other school characteristics were also measured. These include: (a) three factors derived from the 1990 census data for the zip code areas in which the schools are located; (b) measures of classroom orderliness, school safety, personal victimization, morale, planning, and administrator leadership derived from the aggregated reports of teachers; (c) measures of school safety, victimization, fairness and clarity of school rules derived from the aggregated reports of students; and (d) the reports of principals about rates of crime reported to the police, their own leadership behavior, and other characteristics of the school. Most of these measures are described in detail in a technical report (G. D. Gottfredson, Gottfredson, Czeh, Cantor, Crosse, and Hantman, 2000) and in test manuals (G. D. Gottfredson, 1999; G. D. Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1999).

Data from the 1990 census of population were used to obtain scores for three commonly observed community factors: Concentrated Poverty and Disorganization, Urbanicity, and Immigration and Crowding. The measures of these community characteristics are described elsewhere (G. D. Gottfredson et al., 2000; Simonsen, 1998).

Sample

The sample was designed to describe schools in the United States and to describe schools by level and location. Accordingly a sample of public, private, and Catholic schools, stratified by location (urban, suburban, and rural) and level (elementary, middle, and high) was drawn. A probability sample of 1287 schools (143 for each cell in the sample design) was selected.[2] We sought responses to questionnaires by principals on two occasions, from all secondary school teachers, and from a sample of 50 students per secondary school. Details of sampling, school recruitment, and participation rates are provided elsewhere (G. D. Gottfredson et al., 2000). In all, 541 of 855 secondary school principals (63%) participated in the phase 1 principal survey, 393 of 854 secondary principals (46%) participated in the phase 2 survey, 403 of 847 secondary schools (48%) participated at useful levels in the teacher survey, and 310 of 847 secondary schools (37%) participated at useful levels in the student survey.

Measurement and Statistical Procedures

Although the sample was designed so that sampling weights and nonresponse adjustments could be applied to produce estimates for the population of schools, no weighting is applied in the present *correlational* analyses, which combine data from multiple surveys. An examination of weighted and unweighted correlations (and of standard errors assuming simple random sampling of schools with those estimated by resampling methods taking the sample design and weighting into account) is reported by G. D. Gottfredson et al. (2000); it implies that the more straightforward unweighted ecological (school-level) correlations produce substantially the same results as the more complicated estimation method. Weights to take the sample design and make adjustments for nonresponse *are* applied in producing the *normative information* presented here, and standard errors for the weighted estimates have been estimated using a stratified jackknife replication method.

Our concern here is with the measurement of school environments, not individuals. One can examine the homogeneity of the Organizational Focus scale at the individual level, of course. Individual-level α coefficients are presented. But these coefficients provide evidence about the reliability with which *individual differences* are measured. Individual differences – reliable or unreliable – within environments are by definition error in the measurement of organizational units (schools). Reliability with which school environments are measured is estimated by using a hierarchical linear modeling (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992) technique to estimate the size of intraclass correlations (ρ):

$$\hat{\rho} = \hat{\tau}/(\hat{\tau} + \hat{\sigma}^2) \quad . \tag{1}$$

---

[2]A small number of sampled entities turned out not to be schools or to have been closed, leaving 1278 schools in the sample. Only secondary schools are pertinent here, because we did not attempt to measure organizational focus in elementary schools.

where $\hat{\sigma}^2$ is the estimated variance of school means and $\hat{\tau}$ is the estimated variance of individual reports. This is a kind of reliability estimate – an estimate for the report of a single individual about the environment. It is possible to estimate a school-level reliability, λ:

$$\hat{\lambda}_j = \hat{\tau}/(\hat{\tau} + \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{n_j}) \quad . \tag{2}$$

where n_j is the number of individuals reporting in school j. The larger n_j the greater the reliability. Because n_j differs from school to school, $\hat{\lambda}_j$ differs from school to school. In presenting results for the reliability of measures, I show the average of J school-level reliabilities:

$$\hat{\lambda}_{..} = \sum \hat{\lambda}_j / J \tag{3}$$

Weighting is not used in the estimation of reliabilities.

Results

Reliability and Normative Information

The Organizational Focus scale is quite homogeneous at the individual-level in the present sample of teachers, with $\alpha = .94$. More important, the scale has substantial variance between schools, with the intraclass correlation = .26. With multiple teachers making reports in participating schools, the average school-level reliability of the Organizational Focus scale is .86. These results are shown in Table 1, which shows information about the reliability of other measures examined in this report. The Morale and Planning scales (adapted from the Effective School Battery, ESB; G. Gottfredson, 1999), also based on teachers' reports, also have intraclass correlations in the .20s and average school-level reliabilities in the .80s. The Fairness of Rules and Clarity of Rules scales (also adapted from the ESB) have less than 10% of variance between schools, but reports of enough students are aggregated to the school level that school-level reliability appears adequate. The table shows only α coefficients for measures based on principal reports, because there is only one principal in each school and individual and school differences are not measured separately. The leadership characteristics of the principal are estimated not only in principal self-reports, but also in reports by teachers in an adaptation of the ESB Administrator Leadership scale. The measures of school disorder usually have less between school variance than do other measures. Of the disorder scales, the Classroom Orderliness scale has most variance between schools, with $\hat{\rho} = .21$ and $\hat{\lambda}_{..} = .79$. Nevertheless, all of the measures of disorder produce at least moderate average school-level reliabilities.

Normative data for the Organizational Focus scale are shown in Table 2. Scores are calculated as average item responses on a scale of 0-3. The top panel shows information about the distribution of individual-level scores, and the bottom panel shows information about the

distribution of school means.[3] Scores differ little by level. There is a tendency for urban schools to have lower scores than other schools, but the difference is less than a quarter of the standard deviation for schools.

Correlations With School Orderliness and Other School Variables

Correlations between the Organizational Focus scale and other school characteristics are presented separately for middle schools and high schools in Table 3. The scale has remarkably high correlations with school morale and quality of administrator leadership – both based on the aggregated reports of teachers. Correlations of this size raise questions about whether distinct constructs are being measured by the respective scales. An examination of the item content of these scales shows that the content of each is distinctive. Whereas the Organizational Focus scale contains questions about clarity of goals and rewards in the school, the Administrator Leadership Scale contains items such as "the administration is supportive of teachers," and "our principal is a good representative of our school before the superintendent and the board." The Morale scale contains items such as, "Students here don't really care about the school," and "[the faculty is] apathetic" (both reverse scored).

The Organizational Focus scale has substantial correlations with four of the five measures of school orderliness versus disorder. Correlations are largest for measures based on the reports of teachers, but correlations with school safety according to student reports as well as student reports in the Fairness of Rules and Clarity of Rules scales are also substantial. The exception to this pattern is the small negative correlations with the Student Victimization scale.

Correlations with principals' reports about the school are generally smaller, but are always in the expected direction.

Larger high schools tend to obtain lower scores on the Organizational Focus scale, but this is not observed for middle/junior high schools. Organizational Focus scores are relatively independent of measures of the community in which the school is located.

Discussion

Limitations

The main limitation of the present research as a test of the environmental identity or environmental focus idea, as it is embedded in Holland's theory of vocational personalities and work environments, is the lack of explicit measures of other constructs from that theory. This means that the present study is limited to an examination of the correlates of environmental focus, whereas an examination of how focus may moderate the influences of the main influences

---

[3]The mean of school means for all schools is not equal to the mean for all teachers because, in general, an index of means is not equal to an index of means (Stanley, 1957).

of personality types and environmental models would be desirable. The present research is also limited to the school environment as the unit of analysis. Multi-level analyses that examine the influence of environmental characteristics on outcomes for individuals in those environments are not examined here. Additional limitations arise from difficulties in securing the participation of all the sampled schools. School nonparticipation may bias the results in unknown ways. Finally, the results are correlational and cross-sectional in nature. Obviously we could learn more about the influences of Organizational Focus if we could manipulate its level experimentally in large samples of work environments.

Implications

Despite these limitations, this is the first study to report on the application of the Organizational Focus scale to implement the environmental identity construct in a large sample of environments. This first test produced promising results. Organizational focus was significantly and substantially correlated with a range of salutary organizational outcomes based on the reports of both students and teachers in a large sample of schools. Furthermore, the Organizational Focus scale was found to have substantial correlations with the Morale scale, which can be taken as a general measure of organizational health – much as the Vocational Identity scale has been found to have substantial correlations with individuals' psychological well being.

Some recent writing on organizations (Albert, Ashforth, & Dutton, 2000) has suggested that organizational identity is "an internalized cognitive structure of what the organization stands for and where it intends to go" (p. 13). There appear to be multiple uses of the term organizational identity, however, as the separate contributions of other authors in the Albert et al. special issue of the *Academy of Management Review* illustrate. In Holland's theory, an environment's degree of resemblance to the six environmental models can be used to describe "where it intends to go," making it possible to reserve the environmental identity construct to describe *how clear* the organization is about where to go.

Needed Research

Research on all of the environmental formulations in Holland's theory is required. With rare exceptions, researchers appear to take the environmental side of the theory for granted. Spokane, Meir, & Catalano's (in press) review of the literature on person-environment congruence uncovered only a few studies that bothered to *measure* the environment. Why researchers nearly always *measure* the resemblance of persons to the personality types but nearly always *guess at* or *estimate* the resemblance of environments to the environmental models in research is unclear. But it is clear that empirical research testing all of the environmental formulations in Holland's theory is required. In testing the ideas about environmental identity or focus, large diverse samples of *environments* will be required. The preliminary evidence reported here suggests that further tests of this idea will be productive.

References

Albert, S., Ashforth, B. E., & Dutton, J. E. (2000). Organizational identity and identification: Charting new waters and building new bridges (Introduction to special topic forum). *Academy of Management Review, 25*, 13-17.

Bryk, A. S., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1992). *Hierarchical linear models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gottfredson, G. D. (1999). *Effective School Battery: User's manual*. Ellicott City, MD: Gottfredson Associates.

Gottfredson, G. D., & Gottfredson, D. C. (1999). *Development and applications of theoretical measures for evaluating drug and delinquency prevention programs: Technical manual for research editions of What About You (WAY)*. Ellicott City, MD: Gottfredson Associates.

Gottfredson, G. D., Gottfredson, D. C., Czeh, E. R., Cantor, D., Crosse, S., & Hantman, I. (2000). *National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools* (Final report, National Institute of Justice Grant No. 96-MU-MU-0008). Ellicott City, MD: Gottfredson Associates.

Gottfredson, G. D., & Holland, J. L. (1991). *Position Classification Inventory: Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Gottfredson, G. D., & Holland, J. L. (1996a). *Dictionary of Holland occupational codes* (3rd ed.). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Gottfredson, G. D., & Holland, J. L. (1996b). *Organizational focus questionnaire*. Ellicott City, MD: Gottfredson Associates, Inc.

Gottfredson, L. S. & Richards, J. M., Jr. (1999). The meaning and measurement of environments in Holland's theory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 55*, 57-73.

Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational poersonalities and work environments* (3rd ed.). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Holland, J. L., & Baird, L. L. (1968). An interpersonal competency scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 28*, 503-510.

Holland, J. L., Daiger, D. C., & Power, P. G. (1980). *My vocational situation*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Holland, J. L., Gottfredson, D. C., & Power, P. G. (1980). Some diagnostic scales and signs for research and practice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 1191-1200.

Holland, J. L., Gottfredson, G. D., & Nafziger, D. H. (1973). *A diagnostic scheme for specifying vocational assistance* (Report No. 164). Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools. (ED 087 883)

Holland, J. L., Gottfredson, G. D., & Nafziger, D. H. (1975). Testing the validity of some theoretical signs of decision-making ability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22*, 411-422.

Holland, J. L., Johnston, J. A., & Asama, N. F. (1993). The Vocational Identity scale: A disgnostic and treatment tool. *Journal of Career Assessment, 1*, 1-12.

McClosky, H., & Schaar, J. H. (1965). Psychological dimensions of anomy. *American Sociological Review, 30*, 14-40.

Simonson, A. (1998). *The effects of community disorganization on school administrative practices: Implications for delinquency prevention practice*. Unpublished masters thesis. University of Maryland, College Park.

Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., Yoshinobu, L., Gibb, J., Langelle, C., & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 570-585.

Spokane, A. R., Meir, E., & Catalano, M. (In press.). Person-environment congruence and Holland's theory. A review and reconsideration. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 57*.

Stanley, J. C. (1957). Index of means vs. mean of indices. *American Journal of Psychology, 70*, 467-468.

Table 1
Reliability of Organizational Focus Scale and Other Measures

Scale or school characteristic	Source	N items	α^a	$\hat{\rho}$	$\hat{\lambda}_J$
Organizational climate					
Organizational focus	TQ	16	.94	.26	.86
Morale	TQ	11	.81	.28	.88
Planning	TQ	9	.62	.21	.84
School amenability to program implementation	PQ2	9	.76	–	–
Faculty-administration obstacles to implementation	PQ1	12	.76	–	–
School capacity for program development	PQ1	6	.55	–	–
Open identification of problems	PQ1	3	.55	–	–
Teacher-principal communication	PQ1	2	.59	–	–
Fairness of rules	SQ	3	.63	.09	.81
Clarity of rules	SQ	4	.62	.07	.77
School staff turnover[b]	PQ1	2	–	–	–
Leadership					
Administrator leadership	TQ	12	.84	.28	.88
Leadership behavior	PQ2	19	.90	–	–
Accomplishment record of principal	PQ2	7	.70	–	–
Conscientiousness of principal	PQ2	20	.90	–	–
Level of disorder/problem behavior					
School safety, teacher perspective	TQ	8	.94	.17	.75
School safety, student perspective	SQ	13	.80	.12	.86
Classroom orderliness	TQ	14	.92	.21	.79
Teacher victimization	TQ	8	.61	.14	.72
Student victimization	SQ	7	.61	.04	.68

Note. α = alpha reliability for individual-level measure. $\hat{\rho}$ = estimated intraclass correlation. $\hat{\lambda}_J$ = estimated reliability of school-level aggregate; calculated from unweighted data excluding schools with fewer than 10 students (or teachers) unless 70% of sampled students (teachers) responded. PQ1 = phase 1 principal questionnaire, PQ2 = phase 2 principal questionnaire, TQ = teacher questionnaire, SQ = student questionnaire.

[a] Values shown for PQ2 are median alphas for elementary and secondary schools.

[b] Ratio of new teachers this year relative to the total number of teachers. Although the calculation of this item is based on responses to two questions, there is only a single indicator of turnover in the principals' reports.

Table 2
Normative Information for the Organizational Focus Scale Applied to Schools

Group	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	80% CI	*N*
			Individual level		
Teachers in all schools	1.91	.68	.022	1.88 - 1.94	12504
Urban	1.86	.69	.030	1.82 - 1.90	4487
Suburban	1.92	.69	.040	1.87 - 1.97	4339
Rural	1.93	.67	.040	1.88 - 1.99	3678
Middle or junior high	1.96	.68	.028	1.92 - 1.99	6999
High	1.88	.68	.030	1.84 - 1.92	5505
Male	1.89	.68	.026	1.86 - 1.92	4463
Female	1.92	.69	.023	1.90 - 1.95	7979
			School level		
All schools	2.00	.42	.028	1.96 - 2.04	404
Urban	1.93	.39	.040	1.88 - 1.98	123
Suburban	2.02	.44	.048	1.96 - 2.08	125
Rural	2.02	.42	.044	1.96 - 2.08	156
Middle or junior high	1.98	.38	.027	1.94 - 2.01	221
High	2.01	.44	.039	1.96 - 2.06	183

Note. Weighted estimates. *SEM* = standard error of the mean; CI = confidence interval; *N* = unweighted number of teachers (top panel) or schools (lower panel).

Table 3
Correlations Between the Organizational Focus Scale and Other Measures, by School Level

	Middle/Jr.		High		Combined	
Scale or school characteristic	*r*	*n*	*r*	*n*	*r*	*N*
Organizational climate						
Morale, teachers	.84**	215	.85**	189	.84**	404
Planning, teachers	-.06	197	-.02	171	-.04	368
School amenability to program implementation, principal phase 2	.34**	196	.25**	172	.29**	368
Faculty-administration obstacles to implementation, principal phase 1	-.29**	164	-.22*	135	-.26**	299
School capacity for program development, principal phase 1	.06	169	.07	146	.06	315
Open identification of problems, principal phase 1	-.04	175	-.20**	146	-.12*	321
Teacher-principal communication, principal phase 1	.09	177	.17*	154	.13*	331
Fairness of rules, student	.25**	166	.25**	128	.26**	294
Clarity of rules, student	.36**	166	.45**	128	.41**	294
School staff turnover[b], principal phase 1	.00	174	.02	150	.01	324
Leadership						
Administrator leadership, teachers	.81**	215	.82**	189	.82**	404
Leadership behavior, principal phase 2	.04	195	.00	170	.02	365
Accomplishment record of principal, principal phase 2	.03	198	-.28**	173	-.13*	371
Conscientiousness of principal, principal phase 2	.22**	194	-.03	172	.10	366
Level of disorder/problem behavior						
School safety, teacher perspective	.61**	215	.42**	187	.51**	402
School safety, student perspective	.28**	166	.22*	128	.22**	294
Classroom orderliness, teachers	.45**	215	.44**	189	.43**	404
Teacher victimization	-.44**	215	-.47**	189	-.45**	404
Student victimization	-.04	166	-.12	128	-.05	294
School size and community characteristics						
Enrollment	-.01	180	-.26**	157	-.16**	337
Community concentrated poverty and disorganization, 1990 census	-.16*	211	.05	176	-.05	387
Urbanicity, 1990 census	.04	211	-.07	176	-.01	387
Immigration and crowding, 1990 census	-.08	211	-.11	176	-.10	387

Note. *N* = unweighted number of schools.

Appendix A. ORGANIZATIONAL FOCUS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please mark answers by circling one letter to show how well each statement describes your organization.

F	**False**
F	Mostly false
T	Mostly true
T	**True**

1	**F** F T **T**	This school clearly signals to faculty and staff what performance is expected of them.
2	**F** T T **T**	Rules and operating procedures are clear and explicit in this school.
3	**F** F T **T**	It is difficult to determine what is expected of a person in this school.
4	**F** F T **T**	The goals of this school are clear.
5	**F** F T **T**	Everyone understands what behavior will be rewarded in this school.
6	**F** F T **T**	Some persons in positions of power or authority in this school have conflicting expectations for others.
7	**F** F T **T**	Everyone here is working towards the same ends.
8	**F** F T **T**	In this school, people who accomplish the same thing are rewarded in the same way.
9	**F** F T **T**	People are often confused about what objective they should go for in this school.
10	**F** F T **T**	In this school people know what to do and when to do it.
11	**F** F T **T**	People know how to achieve rewards here.
12	**F** F T **T**	People have often said that it is difficult to decide what aims to work towards in this school.
13	**F** F T **T**	This school simultaneously pursues many conflicting goals.
14	**F** F T **T**	My school has a clear focus.
15	**F** F T **T**	My school is torn up by leaders with different agendas.
16	**F** F T **T**	Rules and procedures are often ignored in this school.

Copyright © 1996, 2000 Gary D. Gottfredson and John L. Holland. All rights reserved. To request permission to reproduce this scale, write to Gary D. Gottfredson, Gottfredson Associates Inc., 3239 B Corporate Court, Ellicott City, Maryland 21042.

ORGANIZATIONAL FOCUS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please mark answers by circling one letter to show how well each statement describes your organization.

F	**False**
F	Mostly false
T	Mostly true
T	**True**

1	**F** F T **T**	This environment clearly signals to workers what performance is expected of them.
2	**F** T T **T**	Rules and operating procedures are clear and explicit here.
3	**F** F T **T**	It is difficult to determine what is expected of a person in this organization.
4	**F** F T **T**	The goals of this organization are clear.
5	**F** F T **T**	Everyone understands what behavior will be rewarded in this organization.
6	**F** F T **T**	Some persons in positions of power or authority in this organization have conflicting expectations for others.
7	**F** F T **T**	Everyone here is working towards the same ends.
8	**F** F T **T**	In this organization, people who accomplish the same thing are rewarded in the same way.
9	**F** F T **T**	People are often confused about what objective they should go for in this organization.
10	**F** F T **T**	In this workplace people know what to do and when to do it.
11	**F** F T **T**	People know how to achieve rewards here.
12	**F** F T **T**	People have often said that it is difficult to decide what aims to work towards in this organization.
13	**F** F T **T**	This organization simultaneously pursues many conflicting goals.
14	**F** F T **T**	My organization has a clear focus.
15	**F** F T **T**	My organization is torn up by leaders with different agendas.
16	**F** F T **T**	Rules and procedures are often ignored in this organization.

Copyright © 1996, 2000 Gary D. Gottfredson and John L. Holland. All rights reserved. To request permission to reproduce this scale, write to Gary D. Gottfredson, Gottfredson Associates Inc., 3239 B Corporate Court, Ellicott City, Maryland 21042.